

replicate within brain capillary epithelium, perhaps accounting for the propensity of this organism for causing cerebral abscesses.³ However, including this case, this complication appears to be confined to late onset disease, with possible explanations being the early use of antibiotics, and absence of a putative virulence factor.¹

The combination of cefotaxime and an aminoglycoside is recommended for neonatal Gram negative meningitis, but CSF concentrations of gentamicin may only be marginally above the minimum bactericidal concentration of Gram negative organisms.⁴ Ciprofloxacin has been shown to be effective in Gram negative meningitis, and should be considered in the treatment of this condition.⁵

T J Malpas, J J Munoz

Department of Paediatrics, The General Hospital, Jersey JE1 3QS, Channel Islands; t.malpas@gov.je

I Muscat

Department of Pathology, The General Hospital, Jersey

doi: 10.1136/adc.2003.043398

References

- 1 Doran TI. The role of *Citrobacter* in clinical disease of children: review. *Clin Infect Dis* 1999;28:384–94.
- 2 Gupta P, Gupta D, Singh NP, et al. Vertical transmission of *Citrobacter freundii*. *Indian J Pediatr* 2001;38:110–11.
- 3 Badger JL, Stins MF, Kim KS. *Citrobacter freundii* invades and replicates in human brain microvascular cells. *Infect Immun* 1999;67:4208–15.
- 4 Heath PT, Nik Yusoff NK, Baker CJ. Neonatal meningitis. *Arch Dis Child Fetal Neonatal Ed* 2003;88:F173–8.
- 5 Green SDR, Ilunga F, Cheesbrough JS, et al. The treatment of neonatal meningitis due to Gram-negative bacilli with ciprofloxacin: evidence of satisfactory penetration into the cerebrospinal fluid. *J Infect* 1993;26:253–6.

Recruitment failure in early neonatal research

Rates of neurodevelopmental handicap are high among extremely low birthweight survivors, and the first 48 postnatal hours probably give the greatest opportunity for preventing damage. However, at this time, families are in turmoil and may have difficulty in coming to terms with a small baby in intensive care. We recently had to abandon an observational, non-invasive study because of practical difficulties arising from the new Research Governance Framework,¹ and we would like to share this experience, and its implications, with the research community.

We needed parental consent for the study, which had local research ethics committee approval. Babies had to be ≤ 1500 g birth weight, > 25 weeks gestation, < 48 hours old, ventilated, with an arterial line, and no prior intervention for circulatory compromise. The last two requirements meant that, in reality, babies had to be recruited within the first 12 hours. A non-invasive measurement of peripheral oxygen consumption² was to be made regularly over 24 hours. We aimed to recruit 50 babies over two years.

When an eligible baby was admitted, the parent(s) were given further information before consent was sought a minimum of four hours later. Postnatal recruitment proved difficult. The need to give parents time to consider their decision meant that the opportunity for starting the study was often missed because of changes in the baby's clinical condition.




Figure 1 Recruitment to research project on neonatal unit (NNU) over 12 month period.

With additional local research ethics committee permission, we tried to recruit women at high risk of delivering before term from 25 weeks gestation. The consent process was more complex in this group, as the explanation had to include information about standard neonatal care and procedures. Parents in this group were given 24 hours to come to a decision.

Figure 1 shows that, of 28 eligible babies, only five were recruited. Eight out of nine mothers approached antenatally gave consent, but only two of their babies were studied, as three did not meet the entry criteria and the other three were born elsewhere.

What went wrong? Since the Griffiths report,³ the emphasis has been on obtaining fully informed parental consent, and the research team has to ensure that the parents thoroughly understand the research and its implications. Research where parents signed consent forms, but later claimed that they did not understand the research, was heavily criticised.³ Consequently researchers are reluctant to approach parents who are in any way distressed, because of the difficulty in ensuring valid consent. If it is important for early neonatal research to continue, we urgently need agreement on a sensitive, humane, and realistic framework that is acceptable to both parents and clinical researchers alike.

S Nicklin, S A Spencer

Neonatal Unit, University Hospital North Staffordshire (NHS) Trust, Newcastle Road, Stoke on Trent ST4 6QG, UK; andy.spencer@uhns.nhs.uk

doi: 10.1136/adc.2003.043711

References

- 1 Department of Health. *Research governance framework for health and social care*. London: DoH, 2001. www.doh.gov.uk/.
- 2 Hassan IA, Spencer SA, Wickramasinghe YA, et al. Measurement of peripheral oxygen utilisation in neonates using near infrared spectroscopy: comparison between arterial and venous occlusion methods. *Early Hum Dev* 2000;57:211–24.
- 3 NHS Executive West Midlands Regional Office. *Report of a review of the research framework in North Staffordshire Hospital NHS Trust* [Griffiths report]. Leeds: NHS Executive, 2000. www.doh.gov.uk.

Gestational age in the literature

In neonatology, the correct gestational age (GA) is extremely important, as the viability and survival of the premature baby depend on it. A difference of a few hours or a day can have a substantial impact on the survival and long term morbidity of premature babies.

Doctors are trained to report the GA of a premature baby in exact days—for example, 26⁺4 (GA = 26 completed weeks and 4 days). Reporting the GA in this format helps in understanding and assessing the postnatal and maturational age of premature babies. One would therefore expect GA to be reported exactly in the literature, especially in articles, studies, and trials dealing with survival and morbidity in premature babies. In fact, descriptions of GA are extremely ambiguous in most articles. An example of this ambiguity is survival at 26 weeks GA is